



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

*Am*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,999	01/16/2002	Mansoor Lakhdhir	AUS920010581US1	6331

7590 06/28/2005  
Duke W. Yee  
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP  
P.O. Box 802334  
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER

HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/046,999

Applicant(s)

LAKHDIR ET AL.

Examiner

Kristina B. Honeycutt

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-13,17,18,20-29,33,34 and 36-44 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-13,17,18,20-29,33,34 and 36-44 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on April 11, 2005.

**This action is made Final.**

2. Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 17, 18, 20-29, 33, 34, 36-44 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 17 and 33 are independent claims.

### ***Drawings***

3. The objections to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they included the reference character 616 in Figure 6 not mentioned in the description has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

4. The objections to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the reference character 701 on page 18, line 1 of the specification has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

### ***Claim Objections***

5. The objection to claims 4, 20 and 36 as being unclear has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

6. The objection to claims 6, 22 and 38 as being unclear has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

7. The objection to claims 8, 24 and 40 as being unclear has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

8. The objection to claims 10, 26 and 42 as being unclear has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

9. The rejections to Claims 3, 19 and 35 as lacking antecedent basis for the limitation " the data storage" have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2178

10. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 11-13, 17, 18, 20, 22-24, 27-29, 33, 34, 36, 38-40, 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donohue et al. (U.S. Patent 5987480; date of patent November 16, 1999; filed July 25, 1996) in view of Agrawal et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 20020004813; publication date January 10, 2002; filed March 5, 2001).

**Regarding independent claim 1**, Donohue discloses retrieving a source document for said web page (Fig. 2; col. 8, lines 25-37).

Donohue further discloses locating a plurality of command strings within said source document, wherein each command string of said plurality of command strings includes a respective element type and at least one respective element parameter (Fig. 4; col. 3, lines 51-61; col. 7, lines 45-55; col. 8, lines 15-20, 39-46, 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15; col. 10, lines 49-55).

Donohue further discloses retrieving a respective base string corresponding to said respective element type (Fig. 4; col. 3, lines 62-65; col. 7, lines 45-55; col. 8, lines 3-9, 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15; col. 10, lines 34-37).

Donohue further discloses modifying said respective base string according to said at least one respective element parameter to obtain a rendered string (Fig. 4; col. 3, lines 62-67; col. 4, lines 1-4, 45-58; col. 8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15, 27-29; col. 10, lines 60-67; col. 11, lines 1-9).

Donohue further discloses replacing the command string the source document with the rendered string (Fig. 4; col. 3, lines 62-67; col. 4, lines 1-4, 45-58; col. 8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15, 27-29; col. 10, lines 60-67; col. 11, lines 1-9).

Donohue does not disclose after said retrieving, locating, modifying, and replacing steps, saving said source document as current web page whereby a server responding to a request for dynamic content does not need to render the dynamic content. Agrawal teaches saving a web page so that a server responding to a request does not need to render the dynamic content (p.1, para. 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Donohue and Agrawal before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the current web page taught by Donohue to include saving the web page so that the server does not have to render the page upon request as taught by Agrawal, because saving a web page so that the server doesn't have to render the content, as taught by Agrawal (p.1, para. 10), would allow for quicker display of web pages since the web page only has to be retrieved instead of the dynamic content being rendered in the page.

**Regarding dependent claim 2**, Donohue discloses the base string is retrieved from a data structure (col. 7, lines 35-44; col. 8, lines 3-9).

**Regarding dependent claim 4**, Donohue discloses the at least one element parameter includes one of a name, a value, description, a number columns, or a format modifier (col. 7, lines 45-55; col. 8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15).

**Regarding dependent claim 6**, Donohue discloses the element type is one of checkbox, selection, radio button, text area, button, heading, or title (col. 7, lines 45-55; col. 8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15, 29-32).

**Regarding dependent claim 7**, Donohue discloses the base string includes tags written a structure markup language (col. 8, lines 10-15; col. 10, lines 10-17).

**Regarding dependent claim 8**, Donohue discloses the structured markup language is one of Hypertext Markup Language (HTML), Extensible Markup Language (XML), Wireless Markup Language (WML), or Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML) (col. 8, lines 10-15; col. 10, lines 10-17).

**Regarding dependent claim 11**, Donohue discloses modifying the base string according to the parameters to obtain a rendered string includes replacing a substring within the base string with one of the element parameters (col. 8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15, 27-29; col. 10, lines 60-67; col. 11, lines 1-9).

**Regarding dependent claim 12**, Donohue discloses using one of the element parameters to retrieve a replacement substring from a database (col. 7, lines 35-44; col. 8, lines 3-9) and replacing a substring within the base string with the replacement

Art Unit: 2178

substring (col. 8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15, 27-29; col. 10, lines 60-67; col. 11, lines 1-9).

**Regarding dependent claim 13**, Donohue discloses the method is performed in a rendering program (col. 4, lines 10-13).

**Regarding claims 17, 18, 20, 22-24 and 27-29**, the claims reflect the computer program product for performing the operations of claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8 and 11-13 respectively and are rejected along the same rationale.

**Regarding independent claim 33**, Donohue discloses a bus system and a processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processing unit includes at least one processor (col. 6, line 67; col. 7, lines 1-7) since Donohue discloses a processing unit on a web server that interacts with the Internet and it is obvious that the processing unit must be connected to a bus which connects to a network since the processing unit downloads packages from the Internet and must be connected to a network in order for this to occur.

Donohue further discloses retrieving a source document for said web page (Fig. 2; col. 8, lines 25-37).

Donohue further discloses locating a plurality of command strings within said source document, wherein each command string of said plurality of command strings includes a respective element type and at least one respective element parameter (Fig.



Art Unit: 2178

4; col. 3, lines 51-61; col. 7, lines 45-55; col. 8, lines 15-20, 39-46, 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15; col. 10, lines 49-55).

Donohue further discloses retrieving a respective base string corresponding to said respective element type (Fig. 4; col. 3, lines 62-65; col. 7, lines 45-55; col. 8, lines 3-9, 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15; col. 10, lines 34-37).

Donohue further discloses modifying said respective base string according to said at least one respective element parameter to obtain a rendered string (Fig. 4; col. 3, lines 62-67; col. 4, lines 1-4, 45-58; col. 8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15, 27-29; col. 10, lines 60-67; col. 11, lines 1-9).

Donohue further discloses replacing the command string the source document with the rendered string (Fig. 4; col. 3, lines 62-67; col. 4, lines 1-4, 45-58; col. 8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15, 27-29; col. 10, lines 60-67; col. 11, lines 1-9).

Donohue does not disclose after said retrieving, locating, modifying, and replacing steps, saving said source document as current web page whereby a server responding to a request for dynamic content does not need to render the dynamic content. Agrawal teaches saving a web page so that a server responding to a request does not need to render the dynamic content (p.1, para. 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Donohue and Agrawal before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the current web page taught by Donohue to include saving the web page so that the server does not have to render the page upon request as taught by Agrawal, because saving a web page so that the server doesn't have to render the content, as taught by Agrawal (p.1, para. 10), would

Art Unit: 2178

allow for quicker display of web pages since the web page only has to be retrieved instead of the dynamic content being rendered in the page.

**Regarding claims 34, 36, 38-40, 43 and 44**, the claims reflect the data processing system for performing the operations of claims 2, 4, 6-8, 11 and 12 respectively and are rejected along the same rationale.

11. Claims 5, 21, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donohue in view of Agrawal in further view of Schneider (U.S. Patent 6760746; date of patent July 6, 2004; filed August 31, 2000).

**Regarding dependent claim 5**, Donohue discloses does not disclose the parameter includes a database domain. Schneider teaches including a database domain (col. 9, lines 11-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Donohue and Schneider before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the database taught by Donohue (col. 7, lines 35-44) to include a database domain as taught by Schneider, because including a database domain would enhance the invention since multiple databases could be utilized and a distinction could be made among them.

**Regarding dependent claims 21 and 37**, the claims reflect the computer program product and data processing system for performing the operations of claim 5 and are rejected along the same rationale.

12. Claims 9, 10, 25, 26, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donohue in view of Agrawal in further view of Lakritz (U.S. Patent 6623529; date of patent September 23, 2003; filed January 28, 1999).

**Regarding dependent claim 9**, Donohue discloses a script (col. 7, lines 7-8) but does not disclose the base string includes an embedded script. Lakritz teaches including an embedded script (col. 7, lines 50-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Donohue and Lakritz before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the script taught by Donohue to include an embedded script as taught by Lakritz, because including an embedded script would enhance the invention since users with varying needs would be able to utilize the invention based on their preferences and skills.

**Regarding dependent claim 10**, Donohue discloses the script is one of a client-side script or a server-side script (col. 7, lines 7-8).

**Regarding dependent claims 25 and 41**, the claims reflect the computer program product and data processing system for performing the operations of claim 9 and are rejected along the same rationale.

**Regarding dependent claims 26 and 42**, the claims reflect the computer program product and data processing system for performing the operations of claim 10 and are rejected along the same rationale.

### ***Response to Arguments***

13. Applicant's arguments filed April 11, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding amended independent claim 1, Applicants indicate that Donohue does not teaches a template for a web page being populated after a request is received while the present invention updates and saves the web page offline (p.12, para. 4). The Examiner disagrees because Donohue teaches replacing a command string in the source document with a rendered string (Fig. 4; col. 3, lines 62-67; col. 4, lines 1-4, 45-58; col. 8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15, 27-29; col. 10, lines 60-67; col. 11, lines 1-9) and Agrawal teaches saving a web page so that a server responding to a request does not need to render the dynamic content (p.1, para. 10). The Applicants' argument that Donohue does not teach saving a document as a web page so that the server responding to a request for dynamic content does not need to render the content is moot in light of the new grounds of rejection. Donohue in view of Agrawal teaches

Art Unit: 2178

retrieving, locating, modifying, replacing and saving so that a server responding to a request for dynamic content does not need to render the content.

Independent claims 17 and 33 are rejected under the same rationale as the rejection for independent claim 1 above.

Claims 2, 4, 6-8, 11-13, 18, 20, 22-24, 27-29, 34, 36, 38-40, 43 and 44 depend from independent claims 1, 17 and 33. Therefore claims 2, 4, 6-8, 11-13, 18, 20, 22-24, 27-29, 34, 36, 38-40, 43 and 44 are rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejections above.

Claims 5, 21, and 37 depend from independent claims 1, 17 and 33. Therefore claims 5, 21, and 37 are rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejections above.

Claims 9, 10, 25, 26, 41 and 42 depend from independent claims 1, 17 and 33. Therefore claims 9, 10, 25, 26, 41 and 42 are rejected at least based on the rationale of the rejections above.

### ***Conclusion***

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Method and system for generating and serving multilingual web pages (U.S. Pub. No. 20030005159),
- Method and apparatus for generating web pages from templates (U.S. Pub. No. 20020059327),
- Method and apparatus for generating dynamic graphical representations and real-time notification of the status of a remotely monitored system (U.S. Pub. No. 20020080938),
- Bandwidth savings and QOS improvement for WWW sites by catching static and dynamic content on a distributed network of caches (U.S. Pub. No. 20040128346),
- Document production platform (U.S. Pub. No. 20010044813),

Art Unit: 2178

- Method, system and computer program product for visualizing a data structure (U.S. Patent 6301579).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KBH

  
CESAR PAULA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER